

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

**EDWIN KENNER LYON, 1463298,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**BOBBY GRAY, ET AL.,**

**Defendants.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**NO. 3:14-CV-3249-D**

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and an order of the District Court, this case has been referred to the United States Magistrate Judge. The findings, conclusions and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge follow:

**I. Background**

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed this complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He is proceeding *pro se* and the Court has granted him leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Defendants are Waxahachie Police Officer Bobby Gray, Waxahachie Police Chief Charles Edge, Assistant District Attorney Lindy Tober and District Attorney Patrick Wilson. Process has not issued pending judicial screening.

Plaintiff was convicted of indecency with a child. He claims Officer Bobby Gray altered a police report to change the victim's statement and that Officer Gray altered an affidavit for the arrest warrant. Plaintiff states he was convicted as a result of these actions. Plaintiff claims Assistant District Attorney Lindy Tober concealed the alterations and allowed Officer Gray to testify falsely. He claims Chief of Police Charles Edge failed to properly supervise Officer Gray

and that District Attorney Patrick Wilson failed to learn of the altered documents and inform the defense. Plaintiff seeks money damages.

## **II. Screening**

A district court may summarily dismiss a complaint filed *in forma pauperis* if it concludes the action is : (1) frivolous or malicious; (2) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (3) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). To state a claim upon which relief may be granted, a plaintiff must plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face[.]” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007), and must plead those facts with enough specificity “to raise a right to relief above the speculative level . . . .” *Id.* at 555. “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009). While a complaint need not contain detailed factual allegations, the plaintiff must allege more than labels and conclusions. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555.

## **III. Discussion**

### **1. Supervisor Liability**

Plaintiff alleges Police Chief Charles Edge is liable as a supervisor of Officer Gray. To be liable under § 1983, however, an individual must be personally involved in the acts causing the deprivation of a person’s constitutional rights. *See Lozano v. Smith*, 718 F.2d 756 (5th Cir. 1983). It is well settled that supervisory officials cannot be held vicariously liable for their subordinates’ actions under § 1983. *See Monell v. Dep’t of Social Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 691-95 (1978); *Bigford v. Taylor*, 834 F.2d 1213, 1220 (5th Cir. 1988); *Thibodeaux v. Arceneaux*, 768

F.2d 737, 739 (5th Cir.1985) (per curiam). Supervisory officials may be held liable only if they (i) affirmatively participate in acts that cause constitutional deprivation, or (ii) implement unconstitutional policies that causally result in plaintiff's injury. *See Thompkins v. Belt*, 828 F.2d 298, 303 (5th Cir. 1987). In this case, Plaintiff does not allege that Police Chief Edge personally involved in the deprivation of his rights. Plaintiff has also failed to allege or show that this Defendant implemented an unconstitutional policy that resulted in a violation of his civil rights. Plaintiff's claims against Police Chief Edge should be dismissed.

**2. *Heck v. Humphrey***


Plaintiff claims he was convicted as a result of Officer Gray's alteration of documents and false testimony. These claims are barred by the Supreme Court's decision in *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994). That decision holds that a prisoner cannot bring a § 1983 action challenging his conviction or confinement unless and until the reason for his continued detention has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, or otherwise declared invalid by a state tribunal or federal court. *Heck* also bars damage claims, which, if successful, would necessarily imply the invalidity of a conviction or pending charge. *Hamilton v. Lyons*, 74 F.3d 99, 103 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996).

In this case, Plaintiff states his conviction has not been reversed or declared invalid. (Magistrate Judge's Questionnaire, Answer No. 3.) Hence, no § 1983 cause of action has yet accrued and these claims should be dismissed with prejudice until the *Heck* conditions are met. *See Johnson v. McElveen*, 101 F.3d 423, 424 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) (stating dismissal should be with prejudice until *Heck* conditions are met).

#### **IV. Recommendation**

The Court recommends that: (1) Plaintiff's claims against Police Chief Charles Edge be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); and (2) Plaintiff's remaining claims be dismissed until the *Heck* conditions are met.

Signed this 6<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2015.



PAUL D. STICKNEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND  
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

A copy of this report and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of this report and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Services Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).